



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,220	05/23/2000	Daniel Manhung Wong	OR00-01701	4216

22835 7590 12/24/2003

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 SECOND STREET
SUITE 201
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER

QUINONES, EDEL H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

2

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action SummaryApplication No. **09/577,220**Applicant(s) **WONG, DANIEL MANHUNG**Examiner **Edel H Quinones**Art Unit **2131**

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2131

III. Detailed Action

1. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gongwer et al (U.S. Patent 6,138,120 and Gongwer hereinafter) in view of Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,199,113 and Alegre hereinafter).

In regards to claims 1, 10 and 19, Gongwer teaches a system for sharing a security context between different sessions on a database server (i.e. a system which formally supports the sharing of session, query, stored procedure, and transaction context across multiple, independent client applications) (col. 1, lines 58-61), comprising:

receiving a request at the database server through a database session between the database server and an application on a database client (i.e. an originating application (client) connects to a data server and creates a session, specifying that the session be brand new, and that the new session can be shared by future client connections) (col. 1, lines 44-47);

looking up an identifier for an application client that identifies a client of the application, the identifier having been previously associated with the database session

Art Unit: 2131

(i.e. the server recognizes the clients by assigning a respective identifier, called a session handle, to each client) (col. 2, lines 1-4);

using the identifier to look up the security context (i.e. exclusive security data) for the application client within a storage area (i.e. Securityspace) associated with the database server (col. 4, lines 59-62); and

wherein the security context includes attributes related to the application client (i.e. additional information which can be used, for example, by the security manager to authenticate clients) (col.12, lines 33-35).

Gongwer does not teach performing a database operation to satisfy the request; wherein performing the database operation involves enforcing access rights associated with the security context.

Alegre teaches performing a database operation to satisfy the request (i.e. if the session key is still valid, access server performs the request) (col. 4, lines 63-63); wherein performing the database operation involves enforcing access rights associated with the security context (i.e. authentication database also stores user profile information that defines the types of access each user has to the resources on trusted network) (col. 6, lines 29-31).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer with the teachings of Alegre to include performing a database operation to satisfy the request; wherein performing the database operation involves enforcing access rights associated with the security context with the motivation to achieve a higher level of security for a trusted network in order to

Art Unit: 2131

allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and secure manner (Alegre, col. 2, lines 33-35).

In regards to claims 2, 11 and 20, Gongwer teaches wherein the request includes a database query (i.e. transaction) directed to a database (figure 1, element 5) on the database server (figure 1, element 10). The Office infers that conducting a transaction with a database server comprises directing a query to the database.

In regards to claim 3, 12 and 21, Gongwer does not teach wherein performing the database operation involves modifying the database query to enforce access rights associated with the security context.

Alegre teaches wherein performing the database operation involves modifying the database query to enforce access rights associated with the security context (i.e. the trusted network access presentation information is created based on the user access profile, and thus includes only selection for accessing resources that the user has access to) (col. 4, lines 44-47).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer with the teachings of Alegre to include wherein performing the database operation involves modifying the database query to enforce access rights associated with the security context with the motivation to achieve a higher level of security for a trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and secure manner (Alegre, col. 2, lines 33-35).

In regards to claim 4, 13 and 22, Gongwer does not teach wherein the identifier for the application client identifies a user of the application that is sending the request to the database server.

Art Unit: 2131

Alegre teaches wherein the identifier for the application client identifies a user of the application (i.e. user ID [UID]) that is sending the request to the database server (col. 4, lines 24-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer with the teachings of Alegre to include wherein the identifier for the application client identifies a user of the application that is sending the request to the database server with the motivation to achieve a higher level of security for a trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and secure manner (Alegre, col. 2, lines 33-35).

In regards to claim 5, 14 and 23, Gongwer teaches wherein the database client is an application server that is sending the request to the database server (i.e. the clients are preferably application programs. The application programs can be executing on common computer or on distinct computers) (col. 2, lines 32-34).

Gongwer does not teach wherein the identifier for the application client identifies an application session between the application on the application server and the client of the application.

Alegre teaches wherein the identifier for the application client identifies an application session between the application on the application server and the client of the application (i.e. the packet may be created by merely concatenating a web server identifier, speaker object identifier, or other identifier, to the session key and URL request received from the user). The Office infers that "other identifier" includes the use of an identifier of the application session between the application on the application server and the client of the application.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer with the teachings of Alegre to include wherein the identifier for the application client identifies an application session between the application on the application server and the client of the application with the motivation to achieve a higher level of security for a trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and secure manner (Alegre, col. 2, lines 33-35).

In regards to claim 6, 15 and 24, Gongwer teaches receiving a request from the application to change the application session associated with the database session; and changing the application session associated with the database session (i.e. applications can create, and actively share a session) (col. 11, lines 64-65).

In regards to claim 8, 17 and 26, Gongwer does not teach wherein prior to receiving the request the method further comprises: receiving the security context for the application client from the database client; and inserting the security context into the storage area associated with the database server so that the security context can be indexed by the identifier for the application client.

Alegre teaches wherein prior to receiving the request the method further comprises: receiving the security context for the application client from the database client (i.e. authentication server first receives the UID and PWD from login process as part of the initial login by the user at client browser) (col. 6, lines 24-27); and inserting the security context into the storage area associated with the database server so that the security context can be indexed by the identifier for the application client (i.e. authentication database stores information defining which users may access resources on

Art Unit: 2131

trusted network. Authentication database also stores user profile information that defines the types of access each user has to the resources on trusted network.) (col. 6, lines 29-33).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer with the teachings of Alegre to include wherein prior to receiving the request the method further comprises: receiving the security context for the application client from the database client; and inserting the security context into the storage area associated with the database server so that the security context can be indexed by the identifier for the application client with the motivation to achieve a higher level of security for a trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and secure manner (Alegre, col. 2, lines 33-35).

In regards to claim 9, 18 and 27, Gongwer teaches further comprising allowing the application client to use the same security context through a second application and a second database session (i.e. sessHandle₂) by: receiving a second request at the database server through the second database session with the second application (i.e. passing the received workspace handle (wsHandle₁) to the session manager as part of its session initialization procedure); looking up the identifier for the application client, the identifier having been previously associated with the second database session; and using the identifier to look up the security context for the application client within the storage area associated with the database server (i.e. updating the mapping table for this session's entry to reference the Workspace of the originating client) (col.12, lines 47-65).

Art Unit: 2131

3. Claims 7, 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gongwer et al (U.S. Patent 6,138,120 and Gongwer hereinafter) in view of Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,199,113 and Alegre hereinafter) as applied to claims 5, 14 and 24 above, in further view of Chatterjee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,243,751 and Chatterjee hereinafter).

The teachings of Gongwer and Alegre have been discussed above.

The combination of Gongwer and Alegre, however, does not teach further comprising facilitating connection pooling by periodically changing the application session associated with the database session in order to channel requests associated with multiple application sessions through the database session.

Chatterjee teaches further comprising facilitating connection pooling by periodically changing (i.e. switching) the application session associated with the database session in order to channel requests associated with multiple application sessions through the database session (col. 3, lines 39-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer and Alegre with the teachings of Chatterjee to include further comprising facilitating connection pooling by periodically changing the application session associated with the database session in order to channel requests associated with multiple application sessions through the database session with the motivation to allow more users to use a server than the number of connections established with the server (Chatterjee, col. 3, lines 25-27).

Art Unit: 2131

Other Prior Art Made of Record

4. A. Lo et al. (US Patent No. 5,809,505) discloses a system and method for relational to object mapping;
- B. Bowman-Amuah (US Patent No. 6,556,659) discloses a system for service level management in a hybrid network architecture; and
- C. Carpenter (US Patent No. 6,199,068) discloses a mapping interface for a distributed server to translate between dissimilar file formats.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Points of Contact

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edel H Quiñones whose telephone number is 703-305-8745. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00AM-5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheik can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-⁸⁷²⁻⁴³⁰⁶~~305-3718~~.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Art Unit: 2131



Edel H. Quinones
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

December 18, 2003



GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100